

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Isiah James, Jr.,)	C.A. No. 9:08-0144-TLW-BM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
-versus-)	ORDER
)	
C. Kelly Jackson, Samuel Watson, Robert Ward,)	
Wanda Bouy, Christopher Felder, Shirley Singleton,)	
Lavern Cohen, Cheryl Ridge, John Doe of/and)	
Scientific Testing Laboratories, C. Anthony Burton,)	
Carl Frederick, Daniel J. Murphy, Blake Taylor,)	
Regina Spann, Jon Ozmint and South Carolina)	
Department of Corrections,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

The Plaintiff has brought this *pro se* action against the Defendants under Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983. This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Marchant recommends that the Defendants’ motions to dismiss and/or for summary judgment be granted, with prejudice, with respect to Plaintiff’s federal claims. The Report further recommends that Plaintiff’s state law claim under the South Carolina Freedom of Information Act be dismissed, without prejudice. The Plaintiff has filed objections to the Report. (Docs. # 113, # 115, & # 116).

In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party

may file written objections. . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F.Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of this standard, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections thereto. The Court accepts the Report.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 110); Plaintiff's objections are **OVERRULED** (Doc. # 113, # 115 & # 116); and Defendants' motions to dismiss and/or for summary judgment are **GRANTED**, with prejudice, with respect to Plaintiff's federal claims. Additionally, as recommended in the Report, Plaintiff's state law claim under the South Carolina Freedom of Information Act is **DISMISSED**, without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

February 4, 2009
 Florence, South Carolina